

To:

DEPT. OF CLASSICS

Date:

QUEEN'S UNIV.

KINGSTON, ONT.

Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

11 September 1968

Harold:

I just received your three letters via Gary Murr. It's a relief to be in touch again. By the way, I get mail in Kingston, not Windsor. I cannot understand how any of my mail got to be posted from Windsor, for Queen's Univ. mail was being transported across the border and mailed from Watertown, NY.

Thanks for the address of Dr. Nichols. Lane, in Dissent, mentions Nichols location, and I wrote to him a few days ago to inquire whether he had run tests with the scoped Carcano. I am fully convinced that the Carcano was not used in the assassination. I restrained myself from asserting that publicly because I could not crack the problem of the two fragments that the Secret Service said they found on the floor of JFK's car. If the rifle tests confirm my assertion that bullets fired from the Carcano were on an extremely high trajectory, I would feel justified in raising the suspicion that, like CE399, the two fragments were also planted.

I consider the question of the trajectory more important than the Bieberdorf affair. You may wish to know how that exhibit attracted my attention, for I shall give you references that you may wish to use if you discuss the issue. Penn Jones in FMG 2 mentions an incident regarding harmful first aid to LHO in the jail. When I read his account I supposed that Jones was referring to the Bieberdorf Exhibit, even though his account does not exactly correspond to it, so I made no special mention of it to Jones or to anyone. Later, however, I realized that Jones depended on the account that Manchester describes. In both accounts, a Dallas plainclothesman administers artificial respiration. I suppose that Manchester got it from some vague newspaper account. It was clear, though, that neither Manchester or Jones knew that the situation was even worse than they thought.

Recently I read something that casts yet another shadow over the question of the treatment of LHO. In his Masters thesis for the U. of Indiana, Richard Van Der Kerr discussed interviews that he conducted with Dallas TV newsmen. Tom Alyea told him: "I thought ~~that~~ that they'd take him (the wounded LHO) to either Baylor or to Methodist Hospitals; they were closer to the City Jail." Van Der Kerr's thesis is titled as follows: Crisis in Dallas: an historical study of the activities of Dallas television broadcasters during the period of President Kennedy's Assassination. The quotation is from p.38.

Van Der Kerr's third chapter contains material of interest to Sprague, so I Xeroxed it and sent it to him.

Enclosed is a copy of p. 40 of the thesis, which might interest you. There he refers, I suppose to the possibility that Oswald is the Man in the Downway of Altgens photo. You discuss the same incident in WW2, p245 (Dell). Probably the picture referred to is Altgens, but a couple of discrepancies suggest that it might be another, especially the remark that the picture had not been sent out on the

2
wire service by Monday (25 Nov.). It is my understanding that Altgens was the very first photo to hit the wire.

MURKIN
I believe that the Xeroxed picture connected with Bieberdorf came from the following book: Reiman Morin, Assassination: The Death of President Kennedy (Signet #Q3315). I chopped up my books in order to arrange stuff for presentation at lectures, so I can't be sure which one this came from, but I think it's Morin's book.

I just noticed that the picture is also printed in the following: There Was a President, p.98-- published by Random House for NBC.

The picture is one of about three that appear to have been taken by the same photographer with the same camera. Sprague may know who took it, but mainly he is concerned with photos related to Dealey Plaza.

By the way, Bieberdorf was deposed by counsel (13H83-89) and confirmed that most of the FBI report on him is correct-- he makes some corrections.

Forget about returning the Zapruder picture that I sent you. I got a much better version-- larger and in color-- and do not need the tiny picture. It is frame 235. I believe that I mentioned that the white blob that obscures JFK's face and right temple is a white blob even in the good color version. Clearly the picture was doctored, but it's possible that at the early date when the frame was published in Paris Match it was done for reasons of taste. The picture must have shown JFK's right temple wound.

I wrote to Paris Match in Paris and inquired what made their reporter believe that the "sniper's nest" was the second floor window of the Dal-Tex; they replied that they could find no record which might help them to answer the question. I suggested to Sprague that he contact Paris Match office in New York concerning the matter. They might also have pictures that he has not seen.

The documents on Randle are enclosed. I also sent copies to Sprague who is also interested in Frazier.

There is nothing to report on Simpson. I wrote a few times asking for a reply of any sort, but never got an answer. I got the address from Victoria phone book, so I assume that the address is genuine and that my letters arrived somewhere. If the Simpson that I wrote to was not connected with the assassination, I cannot understand why he should fail to respond and simply tell me so. I used university stationery in the hope of investing my correspondence with an air of respectability, so I doubt whether he would think me a crank. I have simply given up on Simpson, for I do not know what else to do. Perhaps if you know someone in the area you can direct him to find out whether the lead is genuine or not. Here is the address that I used:

Ralph W. Simpson
781 Fairview
Victoria, B.C.
(phone 384-7644)

To:

Date:

Re:

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY MEMORANDUM

I am delighted to know that you have more books under way. Let me know when stuff is available, for I want to read everything.

I am not surprised, of course, but am very glad to know that you are working on the other assassinations. I have been in touch with Sprague on the recent killings, but have not bothered you because I doubted that I could add to what you already possess, and mostly I was just full of suspicions.

I am pursuing a certain hypothesis that is beginning to bear some fruit. I can't briefly explain what led me to believe as I do, so meanwhile please trust that speculations have some basis, although nothing definite.

It's my notion that Ray did not kill MLK; that if he was alive at the time and involved in the plot, he was paid first to attract attention to himself, and then to run. I think Ray is a decoy, and that perhaps a few people may have contributed to the formation of Ray's recent history and movements. Specifically, I am pursuing the notion that the man who was arrested in London was not James Earl Ray, but might even be a man connected with the JFK killing.

Peter Dawnay, who published a couple of Joesten's books, is making inquiries for me in London. He has already spoken with "Ray's" (let's call him the False Ray*-FR) ⁵⁰⁴⁻⁶¹⁸⁵ barrister and will soon speak with FR's solicitor. Also he is seeking witnesses who might have seen FR in London. As I receive reports from him I will pass them on to you and Sprague. The first is enclosed. I sent Dawnay some photos and asked him to determine, if he could, whether the man who was in London was in fact the James Earl Ray who is depicted in the various news photos. I also sent photos of one of the "three tramps" who were arrested in the RR yards after the killing on Dealey Plaza. Sprague associated that man with an FBI composite drawing of the suspect who killed King (Sprague calls him Frenchy). Dawnay's first report indicates that although the London Ray was not Frenchy, he probably is not JERay either. I sent Dawnay more material and more reports will follow. I shall pass them on.

Gary Murr and Trent Gough interviewed witnesses in Toronto, but Gary gave me no definite information about the results, for I gather that Gough told him not to share information. Gary's cryptic remarks left me guessing whether the witnesses identified Frenchy as the Toronto Ray or whether they simply said that he was not the real Ray. In any case, it appears that something "interesting" resulted from the interviews that confirmed somebody's suspicion about something. That's the confusing extent of my information about the Toronto Ray. It infuriates me, this secrecy.

....

Gary told me that Similas was going to give him pictures for an appendix to his book. I wonder, though. It appears that Similas is quick to make promises and slow to deliver. As far as I know, Gary has not seen any of Similas' pictures. I can't figure out what's going on. We have to consider the possibility that there may be something about Gary that causes Similas to be distrustful of him, for if Similas is as erratic as Gary says, anything may be going on

④
in his head. I may be going to Toronto soon and will try to arrange with Gary to have me see Similas too. Perhaps it might do something to reassure the man that somebody besides Gary is interested in him. I don't like to butt in on Gary's "baby" but something has to be tried to break this ridiculous deadlock.

I'll write to my brother and ask whether he has or can get the Cuban "classbook" that you mention. He might supply it even without admitting that he was CIA. I doubt whether he will co-operate, for I can't even penetrate beyond the first veil of getting him to admit CIA attachment.

I have a good excuse to write to him on the topic, for he recently sent me a copy of Epstein's New Yorker article on Garrison. Even before I read the article I wrote and told Tony that I distrusted EX Epstein, and said I would comment later.

Isn't Epstein a beauty, though! That swine! It appears that someone asked him what he could do for his country, and that he responded appropriately by setting himself firmly among the ranks of the disgraced. He even managed to insert in his article a subtle defense of the Warren Report; he puffs out his defense like a quietly hissing fart-- and we all know that they smell a lot worse than the boomers. Henceforth I'll advise people what I have long suspected: that they may regard Epstein as an authority on the only question about which he has authoritative qualifications: What does it profit a man to lose his own soul? I wrote him a brief note and said something like that.

I am making arrangements for lectures in universities in Ontario and Quebec as soon as possible. When I first began to talk on the assassination my material was in disarray, for I burst out on very short notice. But the stuff is nicely arranged now, and I can give an infallible account of what happened on Dealey Plaza. Needless to say, the recent shedding of good red, white, and blue blood has done a good deal to stir interest-- it was there before, but by now it is frantic.

Enough for now. There are some enclosures with material that you may already have seen. I ~~xxx~~ send them anyway, in case you missed them.

Recent developments assure me that Garrison will never be allowed to try Shaw or anyone else connected with the assassination. Can I be assured that even though there may be no trial, Garrison's evidence nevertheless will someday be made public? I hope that Garrison has made arrangements to have the stuff disclosed out of the country if (when?) the worst happens, and when the present covert police state becomes overt.

Cheer up, though. If they resume selling Americans, I'll buy you.

Still,

Dick

Dick Bernabei